

REMARKS

Reconsideration is requested for claims 13-32.

Initially, the undersigned wishes to thank Examiner Pilkington for his time, attention, and consideration during the interview that was conducted at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on June 25, 2009, in connection with the above-identified application.

Claims 15 and 25 were objected to on the grounds of minor informalities. The claims have been amended to address the objections.

Claims 13-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. The claims have been amended to overcome the rejection.

Claims 13-19 and 24-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by DE2431935 (Jelenak).

Claims 13-19, 21, 24-29, and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,606,588 to *Koch*.

Claims 13-17, 19, 22-27, 29, 31, and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,329,825 to *Askins*.

Claims 13, 14, 20, and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by DE 10039768 (Groche).

During the interview, it was acknowledged that Groche does not disclose forming a profiled guiding element as claimed in claim 13.

During the interview, it was further agreed that Jelenak, *Koch*, and *Askins* do not disclose forming flanges by a "profiling gaps" method as claimed in claim 1. Thus, the product claimed in claim 13 is made by a different method than the products disclosed in Jelenak, *Koch*, and *Askins*. During the interview, it was further agreed that *Koch* and *Askins* do not disclose a

combination of features including a piece of sheet metal having two projecting edge flanges on a longitudinal edge thereof as recited in claim 13.

With regard to Jelenak, as explained in the attached Declaration of Peter Groche, the structure of the element disclosed in Jelenak, which is formed in a very hard material via a splitting and subsequent profiling method, is substantially different than the structure of a profiled guiding element as claimed. For example, the splitting and profiling method of Jelenak tends to leave a remnant of a split even after profiling, whereas a flanged element made by a profiling gaps method is made in a softer material and does not result in a split. Moreover, Jelenak requires a hard material to make the flanged element and teaches away from use of a material better suited for use in making a profiled guiding element via a profiling gaps method.

It is respectfully submitted that the pending claims are not anticipated by the applied art. Withdrawal of the rejections is cordially urged.

It is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims, claims 13-32, are in condition for allowance. Allowance is cordially urged.

To the extent that any extensions of time are necessary in connection with this application it is requested that there be a standing petition for extension of time and that any additional fees that are required, or refunds due, in connection with this or any other paper filed in connection with this application be charged to Deposit Account 503015.

If the Examiner should be of the opinion that a telephone conference would be helpful in resolving any outstanding issues, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned.

1217 King Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
(703) 299-0953

Date: July 10, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

WRB-IP LLP

By: /Harold R. Brown III/
Harold R. Brown III
Registration No. 36,341